

REMARKS

Consideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Claims 1-27 are now pending. By this Preliminary Amendment, claims 1, 2, 5-7, 13, and 15 are amended, and new claims 24-27 are added.

The present application is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/558,210. In that application, a non-final Office Action was mailed on October 1, 2003 (paper no. 12). The following remarks are made with reference to that Office Action.

The above-referenced Office Action rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,119,171 to Alkhatib (“Alkhatib”). Also, claims 13-17, 19-21, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,016,512 to Huitema (“Huitema”). Also, claims 18 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema in view of Alkhatib.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites a server connected to a computer network, the server authenticating a query for a secure computer network address having a top-level domain reserved for secure network connections. Applicants do not concede that Alkhatib authenticates a query for a secure computer network address. In any event, Alkhatib fails to teach or suggest a top-level domain reserved for secure network connections, as amended in claim 1.

Claims 2-12, which depend from claim 1, are also allowable for at least those reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

For example, claim 2 recites that the top-level domain name is a non-standard top-level domain name. Alkhatib refers to top-level domains “.com”, “.edu”, “.gov”, “.mil”, “.net”, and “.org”. Alkhatib, col. 1, lns. 35-43. However, these were standard top-level domains at the time of

Applicants' invention, and thus are not non-standard top-level domains as required by the claim. The Examiner apparently also relies upon Alkhatib referring to the domain name "saturn.ttc.com". Alkhatib, col. 1, ln. 45. However, this also uses the standard top-level domain ".com", and not a non-standard top-level domain as required by the claim. The domain name "saturn" is a third-level domain name, the domain name "ttc" is a second level domain name, and the domain name ".com" is the standard top level domain name. Note that "saturn" and "ttc" are not part of the top-level domain.

Also, claim 3 recites that the non-standard top-level domain name is one of .scom, .sorg, .snet, .sgov, .sedu, .smil and .sint. The Examiner refers to Alkhatib at col. 1, lns. 39-43 to teach this feature. This is a baffling anticipation-based rejection, in that Alkhatib fails to mention even a single one of the top-level domain names .scom, .sorg, .snet, .sgov, .sedu, .smil, or .sint specifically listed in claim 3. Applicants request that the Examiner point out precisely where Alkhatib discloses even a single one of these recited top-level domain names.

Independent claim 13 recites verifying ownership information for an equivalent non-secure domain name corresponding to a secure domain name. Huitema fails to teach or suggest this feature. Indeed, Huitema fails to teach or suggest both a secure domain name and an equivalent non-secure domain name corresponding to the secure domain name. The Examiner refers to col. 4 of Huitema, but this merely discloses various data sets containing domain names. Huitema further discloses that an address such as "192.4.18.101" can be used to build the inverse name "101.18.4.192.in-addr.arpa.". However, this pair of addresses is not a secure domain name and a corresponding non-secure domain name as required by claim 13.

Claim 13 further recites registering the secure domain name in a secure domain name service

when the ownership information for the equivalent non-secure domain name is consistent with ownership information for the secure domain name. Huitema also fails to teach or suggest this feature. Huitema is unconcerned with whether any ownership information is consistent with anything else, much less whether ownership information for a non-secure domain name is consistent with ownership information for a secure domain name. Again, Huitema does not even disclose the secure and corresponding non-secure domain names as required by claim 13.


Independent claims 15, 17, and 21 are also allowable for at least similar reasons as those set forth above with regard to claim 13, and further in view of the various differing features recited therein.

Claims 14 and 24, which depend from claim 13, claims 16 and 25, which depend from claim 15, claims 18-20, which depend from claim 17, and claims 22 and 23, which depend from claim 21, are also allowable for at least those reasons set forth above with regard to their respective independent claims, and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

For example, claims 18 and 22 recite that the first domain name comprises a non-standard top-level domain and the second domain name comprises a standard top-level domain. The Examiner concedes that Huitema fails to teach or suggest this feature. Alkhatib similarly fails to teach or suggest this feature because, as previously discussed, Alkhatib fails to teach or suggest a non-standard top-level domain.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants submit that the pending claims distinguish over the applied references, and are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that further discussion and/or amendment would be helpful in the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number appearing below.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 
Jordan N. Bodner
Registration No. 42,338

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 824-3000

Dated: May 18, 2004